

The Inauguration of Ministers in Scotland: 1560-1620

REV. DUNCAN SHAW, PH.D.

FIRST of all it should be noted that none of the Scottish reformers used the words "ordination" or "consecration".¹ The term "inauguration" was employed when referring to the initial appointment of a minister to a parish² or a bishop to a diocese.³ It was also used in connection with the

- ¹ The word was, however, used by state officials in framing documents based on English post-reformation styles. (*Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum. The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland. 1567-1574.* (ed. G. Donaldson). Edinburgh, 1963 (later referred to as *R.S.S.*). vol. vi, Nos. 1473, 1474, 1672, 1825, 2175, 2309, and *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, from the year MDLX.* (ed. T. Thomson), Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs, Edinburgh, 1839-45 (later referred to as *B.U.K.*). p. 219 should be compared with Rymer, *Foedera, Conventiones, Literae et cujuscunque generis Acta Publica inter Reges Angliae*, London, 1704-17, vol. xv, p. 552: and *B.U.K.*, p. 220 (but cf p. 246) compared with *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic. Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I, 1547-80* (ed. R. Lemon), London, 1856. p. 150, No. 23, text printed by G. W. Prothero, *Select Statutes and Documents illustrative of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, Oxford, 1894. p. 243). The use of the word "consecratt" by Walter Cullen, reader of Aberdeen, in connection with the inauguration of David Cunningham to the bishopric of Aberdeen on 11th November, 1577, is an exception (W. Cullen, "The Chronicle of Aberdeen 1491-1595" in *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club* (ed. J. Stuart), Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1842, vol. ii, pp. 46-47). This may be explained by his close association with pre-reformation ecclesiastical practice. He was collated to the vicarage of Aberdeen by the placing of a ring on his finger by William Gordon, the Roman bishop of Aberdeen, on 26th June, 1577 (Cullen, *Ibid.*, p. 45).
- ² *B.U.K.*, *passim*, e.g., pp. 27, 28, 54, 173, 176, 196: *The History of the Kirk of Scotland by David Calderwood* (ed. T. Thomson), Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842-9 (later referred to as *Calderwood, History*), vols. i-iv, *passim*: "Extracts from the Registers of the Presbytery of Glasgow and the Kirk Sessions of Edinburgh and Stirling prior to the year MDCI" in *The Miscellany of the Maitland Club* (ed. A. MacDonald and J. Dennistoun), Maitland Club, Edinburgh, 1833. vol. i, p. 95: *Memorials of Transactions in Scotland A.D. MCLXIX-MDLXXIII*, by Richard Bannatyne, secretary to John Knox (ed. R. Pitcairn), Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1836, p. 280. T. Leishman, in his very defective contribution, "Ordination: Recent Doctrine and Practice" in *The Pentecostal Gift*, Glasgow, 1903, p. 211, is totally ignorant of this. He uses "inauguration" when making scathing references to Congregational ministers whom he personally did not consider to have been "ordained".
- ³ *B.U.K.*, *passim*, cf, e.g., p. 386: *Calderwood, History, passim*: "Extracts from the Accounts of the Burgh of Aberdeen" in *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club* (ed. J. Stuart), Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1852, vol. v, p. 104: *The History of the Kirk of Scotland, for the year 1558 to August, 1637*, by John Row (ed. D. Laing), Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842 (later referred to as *Row, History*), p. 261: *An Apologetic Narration of the State and Government of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation*, by William Scot (ed. D. Laing), Wodrow Society, 1846 (later referred to as *Scot, Narration*), p. 25.

appointment of elders and deacons. In the same way, there was no reference made to "induction": "admission" was the word used.¹ The expression "ordination" was reintroduced in the second Book of Discipline but, like the word "induction", it only came into limited use during the last decade of the sixteenth century with the preparation for the institution of the episcopacy of 1610.

The Scottish reformers, like those on the continent and some in England,² carefully chose such words with thoughtful precision. The avoidance, in this matter, of medieval terminology that had been common for centuries, was quite deliberate.³ New phrases were introduced after careful consideration of the implications involved in the complete departure from

¹ *B. U. K.*, *passim*: Calderwood, *History*, *passim*: *The Acts of Parliaments of Scotland* (ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes), Edinburgh, 1814-75 (later referred to as *A. P. S.*), vol. iii, p. 23: *Register of the Ministers, Elders and Deacons of . . . St. Andrews* (ed. D. H. Fleming), S.H.S., Edinburgh, 1889, vol. i, p. 75: *Cases decided in the Court of Session, Court of Judiciary, and the House of Lords*, 1888-89 (ed. by various reporters), Edinburgh, 1889, pp. 730-1. The revisers and enlargers of H. J. Witherspoon and J. M. Kirkpatrick, *A Manual of Church Doctrine*, London, n.d., now entitled *A Manual of Church Doctrine according to the Church of Scotland*, London, 1960, have, on p. 92. and n., by inference suggested that this word was merely used in connection with elders and the term "ordination" avoided while being unaware that this word was used indiscriminately whether bishops, ministers, elders, or deacons were involved (cf. p. 167 in the original edition).

² Cf. More's criticism of the use of seniors for priests, congregation for church, love for charity, favour for grace, repentance for penance, knowledge for confession, troubled for contrite (*The English Works of Sir Thomas More. Reproduced in facsimile from William Rastall's edition of 1557*, (ed. W. E. Campbell), London, 1931, vol. ii, pp. 206 *et seq.*: also W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Bible Translation: some Reformation Controversies and their Background*, Cambridge, 1955, *passim*).

³ E.g., the absence of the word "clergy" in Scottish reformers' writings, except when referring to the Roman clergy (e.g., *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland*, (ed. W. C. Dickinson), Edinburgh, 1949 (later referred to as *Knox. History*), vol. i, p. 44), in accordance with Calvin's criticism of its medieval ecclesiastical usage (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, book IV, chap. iv, para. 9, and his comment on I Peter, chap. v, verse 3), while the Roman controversialists continued to use the word (e.g., *Certain tractates: Together with the book of four score three questions and a Translation of Vincentius Lirinensis*, by Ninian Winzet (ed. J. K. Hewison), Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1888 (later referred to as *Winzet, Certain Tractates*), vol. i, p. 64). The word "clergy" was used by some of the pro-episcopal party in Scotland, late in the sixteenth century, e.g., by Patrick Adamson, archbishop of St. Andrews (Calderwood, *History*, vol. iv, p. 517), and came into more general use in the Church in Scotland at the beginning of the seventeenth century under the influence of the Aberdeen doctors (cf. e.g., *The Funeral Sermons . . . on the death of Patrick Forbes, Bishop of Aberdeen* (ed. C. F. Shand), Spottiswood Society, Edinburgh, 1845, p. 73). Such usage was, however, constantly resisted. In 1586, this was stated to smell of the pride of papistry by James Melville (Calderwood, *History*, vol. iv, p. 517). For a typical seventeenth century Scottish criticism, cf. G. Gillespie, *An Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1641, pp. 1-7.

It should also be noted that the word "cleric" was never used and "clerk" was used only with reference to Roman clergy (e.g., *A Compendious Book of*

canon law. The continental¹ and Scottish² reformers were at one in their determination to rid the church of canon law and its influence. The new biblical understanding of the doctrine of the church and its ministries played an important part in the education of the people and in the building up of concepts true to the biblical basis of the reformed Church. This is all the more noteworthy when it is remembered that much was taken over from the past and continued in use.

The employment of the word "inauguration", while Roman Catholic writers still adhered to the word "ordination",³ is important and demonstrates the distinct difference made by the Scottish reformers between the Roman view of the sacrament of ordination and the doctrine and practice of appointing ministers to parishes in Scotland. It also shows the continuing desire of the Church in Scotland "to labor to have things rightlie worded".⁴

Godly and Spiritual Songs (ed. A. F. Mitchell), Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1897 (later referred to as *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*), p. 190). The one exception was John Davidson in his *Ane Dialog or Mutual Talking between a Clerk and ane Courteour*, Edinburgh, 1573 (S.T.C. No. 6323) in which the word was used for literary effect.

¹ M. Luther, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung*, 1520, in *Werke*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimar, 1883 *et seq.*, vol. vi, pp. 381-469, *passim*: E. Pfisterer, "Calvin im Kampf mit dem Kanonischen Recht" in *Calvins Wirken in Genf*, Neukirchen, 1957, pp. 57-63. Above all, the influence of François Hotman must be remembered. The best account of him in English is by D. B. Smith, "François Hotman" in *The Scottish Historical Review* (later referred to as *S.H.R.*), Glasgow, 1916, vol. xiii, pp. 328-65.

² For a popular view cf. *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, p. 196. In "The First Oration, and Petition of the Protestants of Scotland to the Queen Regent" is stated, "we are content not only that the rules and precepts of the New Testament, but also the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the godly approved laws of Justinian the Emperor [i.e., as opposed to Roman canon law], decide the controversy betwix us and them [i.e., the prelates]", (Knox, *History*, vol. i, p. 151). The reformers' hope that canon law would cease to have authority was fulfilled by the passing into law of the Acts of Parliament of 1560 and 1567 which enacted that "the bischope of Rome haif na jurisdiction nor autoritie within this realme in tymes cuming", (*A.P.S.*, vol. ii, p. 534, and vol. iii, p. 14). This denial of papal jurisdiction meant there ceased to be any source of authority for canon law in Scotland. The coronation oath, framed in 1567, re-enforced this. The sovereign promised to "reule the pepill committit to thair charge according to the will and command of God, revelit in his foirsaid word, and according to the lovabill Lawis and constitutionis ressaift in this Realme, nawyse repugnant to the said word of the eternall God" (*Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 23). The influence of Hotman on Andrew Melville must not be overlooked: Melville studied under him in Geneva (*The Autobiography and Diary of Mr. James Melville* (ed. R. Pitcairn), Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842 (later referred to as *Melville, Diary*), p. 42 and cf. *Ibid.*, p. 112).

³ Winzet, *Certain tractates*, vol. i, pp. 42, 99: *The historie of Scotland wrytten first in Latin by the most reuerend and worthy Jhone Leslie, Bishop of Rosse, and translated into Scottish by Father James Dalrymple* (ed. E. G. Cody), Scottish Text Society, Edinburgh, 1888, vol. i, pp. 106, 114.

⁴ MS. Records of the Presbytery of Fordyce, 1651.

This paper therefore aims at giving an account of how ministers were inaugurated and admitted to their parishes before a uniform procedure was laid down in 1620.¹ It is impossible within the compass of this paper to deal adequately with the continental background; this would involve a resumé of the practice not only of the churches that followed Calvin but also of those that followed Luther, Zwingli and Bucer, all of whom contributed to the theological understanding and constitutional development of the Scottish Church.²

Two documents, known in 1560, give us some information about the method of inauguration to parishes. The first was *The forme of prayers and ministration of the Sacraments, &c., used in the Englishe Congregation at Geneua*, Geneva, 1556.³ *The forme of prayers* was printed in Geneva in 1556, 1558, 1561, and in Edinburgh in 1562,⁴ and was almost certainly in limited use in Scotland before 1560 together with *The Book of Common Prayer . . . in the Church of England*, London, 1552, generally known as the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.⁵ After the reform of the Church, *The forme of prayers* became, by implication in the Book of Discipline, the recognised "book of common order" of the Church in Scotland.⁶

The mode of election, inauguration and admission was quite straightforward. The congregation was convened by the ministers and the elders. At this meeting a leet of two or three was drawn up when there was a choice. From this leet the ministers and elders chose one whom "they signified vnto the congregation" at least eight days before the day appointed for the election. The congregation was exhorted to fast and pray during this time "that bothe their election may be agreable to [God's] will, and also profitable to the churche". Should anything be brought against the nominee and found proven, he was to be dismissed and another presented. If nothing was alleged, one of the ministers, at the morning sermon on the day of appointment, presented the nominee to the congregation. The whole or part of the sermon set out the duties of the

¹ Although the procedure was not always followed (cf. pp. 61-2 *infra*).

² I hope later to deal with some of these matters.

³ This is conveniently reprinted in W. D. Maxwell, *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book*, Edinburgh, 1931, (later referred to as Maxwell, *Genevan Service Book*), pp. 165-8. The notes on pp. 168-174 are not always accurate and the title given to the section, "The Election and Ordination of Ministers", is misleading as the word "ordination" is never used in the Book.

⁴ W. Cowan, *A Bibliography of the Book of Common Order and Psalm Book of the Church of Scotland, 1556-1644*, Edinburgh, 1913, Nos. 1-7.

⁵ G. Donaldson, *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637*, Edinburgh, 1954, pp. 3 *et seq.*

⁶ The text quoted in this paper is that printed in Knox, *History*, vol. ii, pp. 280-325. For references to "the book of common order", cf. *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 282, 296, 313.

minister. In the afternoon, the officiating minister called upon the congregation to elect after which extempore prayer was offered. When the nominee was elected, the presiding minister prayed, again extemporaneously, giving thanks to God and requesting "such thinges as shalbe necessarie" for the new minister's office. The nominee was then appointed and, after singing a psalm, the congregation departed.¹

The second document was the Book of Discipline, 1560: three sections of this are important, viz., "The fourth Head, Concerning Ministers and their Lawful Election"²; "IV (3) Admission of Ministers";³ IX (6) For Punishment of those that profane the Sacraments and do contemn the Word of God, and dare presume to minister them, not being thereto lawfully called".⁴ As these statements are, in effect, a commentary on the section of *The forme of prayers*, it is unnecessary to elaborate upon them apart from noticing the paragraph in IV (3) and the final paragraph of IX (6): "Other ceremony than the public approbation of the people, and declaration of the chief minister, that the person there presented is appointed to serve that Kirk, we cannot approve; for albeit the Apostles used the imposition of hands, yet seeing that the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge is not necessary".⁵ "It is neither the clipping of their crowns, the crossing⁶ of their fingers, nor the blowing of the dumb dogs called the Bishops, neither yet the laying on of their hands, that maketh them true Ministers of Christ Jesus. But the Spirit of God inwardly moving the hearts to seek Christ's glory and the profit of his Church, and thereafter the nomination of the people, the examination of the learned, and public admission (as before is said) makes men lawful Ministers of the word and sacraments".⁷

Many statements and explanations have been made in attempts to get round the clear meaning of these words.

An effort has been made to prove that the Book of Discipline was not an authoritative expression of the Church's mind.⁸ Sprott alleges that it

¹ Maxwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 321-2.

² Knox, *History*, vol. ii, pp. 283-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 286.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 286-7.

⁶ Or "greasing".

⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 322, cp. *B. U. K.*, p. 16. The phrases "lawfully called", "the public approbation of the people", and "the nomination of the people" cannot be fully dealt with in this paper as many questions come automatically to mind and the theories lying behind them demand further investigation. It is hoped that they may be considered on some future occasion together with some examination of the development of patronage in the period after 1567.

⁸ H. J. Wotherspoon, "Adequate Security for the Continuance of the Ministry" in *Reunion, the Necessary requirements of the Church of Scotland*, Scottish Church Society Conferences, Fourth Series, Edinburgh, 1909 (later referred to as Wotherspoon, *Adequate Security*), pp. 22-3.

"was never law, civil or ecclesiastical"¹ and "account for it as we may, it was not the dictum of the Church, for the first Book of Discipline never received ecclesiastical sanction, and there is no evidence of its having been ever acted on".² The Book of Discipline, on the contrary, played a great part in the life of the Church immediately after 1560. Superintendents had to sign it prior to election:³ it formed the basis of the Church's policy on constitutional and disciplinary matters, the universities, schools, and much else.⁴ It will also be shown that there is still much evidence extant to prove that the attitude of the Book of Discipline to inauguration survived into the seventeenth century.⁵

Sprott strives, in another place, to apply the above-quoted paragraph from the Book of Discipline merely to the admission to parishes of former priests⁶ and, although the clear intention of the paragraph was that it should apply to all,⁷ Sprott has misled many scholars since his time.⁸ This aspect of inauguration will be considered later.⁹

In 1963 the most absurd assertion was made that "Though the first Book of Discipline omitted reference to the laying on of hands there is no reason for supposing that the practice was departed from",¹⁰ and, two years later, it was further claimed that "no clear case [of the laying on of hands being omitted] has so far been proved".¹¹ These pronouncements, like earlier remarks, were influenced by dogmatic considerations. As will be shown, they are not only tendentious but untrue.

¹ G. W. Sprott, "The Historical Continuity of the Church of Scotland" in *Scottish Church Society Conferences*, First Series, Edinburgh, 1894, p. 165.

² G. W. Sprott, "Ordination: Doctrine and Practice of the Reformation, and of the Reformed Churches" in *The Pentecostal Gift*, Scottish Church Society, Glasgow, 1903 (later referred to as Sprott, *Ordination*), p. 196.

³ Calderwood, *History*, vol. ii, p. 185.

⁴ D. Shaw, *The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, 1560-1600. Their Origins and Development*, Edinburgh, 1964 (later referred to as Shaw, *General Assemblies*), *passim*.

⁵ Cf. pp. 60-1 *infra*.

⁶ G. W. Sprott, *The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1882 (later referred to as Sprott, *Offices*), p. 196.

⁷ Cf. pp. 41-4 *infra*.

⁸ Errors appear in two directions, e.g., (1) "as a rule those who were admitted under it were in Spottiswoode's position. They were clergyman (*sic*) already" (T. Leishman, "The Ritual of the Church of Scotland" in *The Church of Scotland* (ed. R. H. Story), London, 1892, vol. v, p. 347); (2) "The Church of Scotland at no time officially abandoned the laying on of hands" (G. D. Henderson, *Church and Ministry*, London, 1951, p. 161).

⁹ Cf. pp. 42-4 *infra*.

¹⁰ *Reports to the General Assembly with the Legislative Acts*, 1963, Edinburgh, 1963, p. 754.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1965, Edinburgh, 1965, p. 691.

The Book of Discipline was authoritative and was undoubtedly accepted without question by General Assemblies and by the Church at large, though its financial implications did not commend it to the Three Estates. It should, however, not be forgotten that the Book of Discipline was not printed until it appeared in 1586 in the suppressed edition of Knox's *History* that was printed by Vautrollier in London; even this edition was incomplete as it broke off before the end of the first paragraph of "the fyft Heid".¹ The first complete edition of the Book did not appear until 1621 and was actually printed in Holland.²

As far as parishes were concerned the main influence came, therefore, from *The forme of prayers*. This influence was further reinforced in 1564, 1565, 1566, and 1567, when editions of the Book of Common Order were printed.³ In these, reference to the inauguration of ministers was merely a reprint of what had already appeared in *The forme of prayers*.

The rather ingenious notion of Sprott that there was no imposition of hands during the immediate post-reformation period in Scotland because "the appointment of pastors consisted very much in the induction of Reformed priests to settled charges"⁴ has tended to become accepted as an accurate interpretation of historical facts,⁵ though some scholars have not been at all satisfied with such a facile argument.⁶

As has been shown, the Church did not favour the laying on of hand but there is a further question that has up until now been overlooked. The general practice within the churches that followed Calvin was to demand from monks and priests who sought admission as ministers not only a renunciation of popery, but also a renunciation of the orders they had received in that church. Calvin wrote on 12th December, 1554, to Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland: "... the whole Popish priesthood is not only an impious profanation of the true ministry but an execrable contumely upon Christ so that whosoever is a Popish priest cannot, till he abjure that title, be a servant of Christ. Thus, though according to their pretensions the character of the priestly office is indelible, yet nevertheless

¹ Calderwood, *History*, vol. viii, Appendix, p. 283: *The Works of John Knox* (ed. D. Laing), Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1846 (later referred to as Knox, *Works*), vol. i, pp. xxxii-iii, xxxix-xlii.

² *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad* (compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave), London, 1926 (later referred to as S.T.C.), No. 22015.

³ Cowan, *Bibliography*, Nos. 8-10.

⁴ Sprott, *Sermon*, p. 20, and *Offices*, p. 196.

⁵ E.g., by W. McMillan, *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638*, Edinburgh, 1931 (later referred to as McMillan, *Worship*), p. 343.

⁶ E.g., Maxwell, *Genevan Service Book*, p. 171.

it behoves it to be eradicated and obliterated before the Church of God can possess undefiled priests. The Popish priesthood is deservedly held in abhorrence of all pious men for another mark of infamy".¹ The National Synod of the reformed Church of France were of much the same mind, enacting that priests and monks had to serve for a probationary period of two years before being *ordained* and that ordination could only take place with the sanction of the Provincial and National Synods.²

At the Synod of Dort, 1575, it was laid down, among other things, that monks and priests who desired to enter the reformed ministry had, to renounce not only popery, but also their own orders received in the Roman Church.³ The tradition long continued to influence many. In England, for example, those who followed Geneva rather than Canterbury could say in 1593, "Popishe priests by force of their admissyon cannot be Ministers of the Ghosples".⁴

Thus the Scottish Church did not differ in doctrine and practice from the rest of the reformed churches when it stated that the Papistical Kirk's "ministers are no ministers of Christ Jesus"⁵ or (as is said in another place), "that in all the rabble of the clergy there is not one lawful minister, if God's word, the practice of the Apostles and their own ancient Laws shall judge of lawful election".⁶

The practice of renouncing the ordination received at the hands of Roman bishops was known in Scotland. In fact, every former Roman priest who was associated with the Supplication presented to the Three Estates in 1560⁷ or who accepted the Confession of Faith, 1560, in effect

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum* (ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss), Brunswick, 1876, vol. xliii, p. 334. The translation is taken from *Letters of John Calvin* (ed. J. Bonnet and translated by M. R. Gilchrist), Philadelphia, 1858, vol. iii, p. 107.

² *Discipline or Book of Order of the Reformed Churches of France* (ed. M. G. Campbell), London, 1924 (later referred to as Campbell, *Book of Discipline*) p. 1. Sprott ignored this, although the information was available in his day (*Synodicon in Gallia Reformata* (ed. J. Quick), London, 1692 (later referred to as Quick, *Synodicon*), vol. i, pp. xvi-xvii) and he had at least looked at this book (Sprott, *Offices*, p. 244), while he quoted Saravia whose statements cannot be substantiated from contemporary official sources (Sprott, *Ordination*, p. 195).

³ G. Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen, in en ontrent de Nederlanden . . .*, Amsterdam, 1677, vol. i, p. 555. Cf. H. H. Kuyper, *De Opleiding tot den Dienst des Woords bij de Gereformeerden*. 's-Gravenhage, 1891, p. 181 and n.

⁴ *The Second Parte of a Register, . . . 1597* (ed. A. Peel), Cambridge, 1915, vol. i, p. 258, cf. pp. 150 and 305.

⁵ Confession of Faith, 1560. Chap. XXI of the Sacraments, in Knox, *History*, vol. ii, p. 269.

⁶ Knox, *History*, vol. i, p. 337.

⁷ *Ibid.*

renounced his ordination¹ if he had not already done so: but this was not the only issue. There were also, within the reformed Church, priests who had been degraded from major or minor orders by Roman ecclesiastical authorities.² One of the most obvious cases of both was that of John Knox who was ordained a priest on 15th April, 1536.³ He was deposed, degraded,⁴ and burned in effigy in 1556.⁵ This was taken so seriously by the Lords of the Congregation that they were uncertain as to whether or not he should be allowed to preach in St. Andrews on 11th June, 1559, since the archbishop of St. Andrews objected that he would not permit it "considering that by his commandment the picture of the said John was before burnt". This incident is all the more significant when it is remembered that it is recounted by Knox himself.⁶ It is also certain, that though Knox refused to recognise the sentence passed upon him on the grounds that it was illegal,⁷ he went out of his way to renounce his ordination. This is quite clearly stated in words written to Knox during his lifetime. "Quilk auctoritie of preisthed geue ze esteme as nochtis, be reason it wes geuin to zow (as ze speik) be ane papiste bischope, and thairfor renunceis it, and seikis ane vther ordination of secularis".⁸ "Zour lauchful ordination . . . we desyre zou to schaw; sen ze renunce—And that to zour

¹ Cf. Confession of Faith, 1560, Chap. XXI Of the Sacraments, in Knox, *History*, vol. ii, p. 269.

² Cf. the styles in *St. Andrews Formulare*, 1514-1546 (ed. G. Donaldson), Stair Society, Edinburgh, 1944, vol. ii, Nos. 361 and 378. There is little known of the number of reformers in Scotland who were degraded from major or minor orders. Henry Forrest was degraded from minor orders before he was burnt for heresy (J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments of these latter and perlious days touching matters of the Church* (ed. S. R. Cattley and G. Townsend), London, 1837-41, vol. iv, p. 579). This probably took place in 1533 (Knox, *History*, vol. i, pp. 21-2 and n., and R. Keith, *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland* (ed. J. P. Lawson), Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, 1844, vol. i, p. 15). Others were degraded abroad; e.g., John Craig must have been deposed and most probably degraded in Rome as he was sentenced to be burned as a heretic there (*The History of the Church of Scotland by John Spottiswood* (ed. M. Napier), Bannatyne Club and Spottiswoode Society, Edinburgh, 1850, vol. iii, p. 92).

³ *The Innes Review*, Glasgow, 1955, vol. vi, pp. 42-5, and cf. pp. 99-106, and vol. xvi, pp. 134-5.

⁴ It should be remembered that it was only after this date that Knox was relieved of the obligations of using the breviary and remaining celibate. A survey of this whole subject can be found in F. Kober, *Die Deposition und Degradation nach den Grundsätzen des kirchlichen Rechts*, Tübingen, 1867. It is interesting to notice in this connection that Knox did not marry until the spring of the following year although he had been betrothed to Marjory Bowes since 1553 (Knox, *Works*, vol. vi, p. 516).

⁵ Knox, *History*, vol. i, p. 124, and cf. Knox, *Works*, vol. iv, p. 464.

⁶ Knox, *History*, vol. i, p. 181.

⁷ Knox, *Works*, vol. iv, pp. 461-520.

⁸ Winzet, *Certain Tractates*, vol. i, p. 21.

grete schame, brother!—and eftemis that ordination null, or erar wickit, be the quilk sumtyme ze callit Schir Iohne".¹ Knox never denied these allegations. He placed importance only on his call to preach that he had received from the Castilians in April, 1547.²

The second Helvetic Confession was mentioned, as early as 1902 in support of certain asseverations about the election, inauguration and admission of ministers.³ We must, therefore, examine the facts.

This particular Confession was printed at Zurich in March, 1566, by Christoph Forschauer.⁴ The General Assembly of June, 1566, transmitted the book to a committee composed of "the Superintendents together with many other most qualified Ministers", to "convene at Santandrews, and having read the letters" from the churches sending the Confession "and, the Confession, send answer, that we agree in all points these Churches and differ in nothing from them, except that we assent not in keeping festival days seeing the Sabbath day is only kept in Scotland".⁵

When it is remembered that there was probably only one copy of this Confession sent, and that this was about 25,000 words in length and written in Latin and that it would take some time to come from Zurich to Scotland,⁶ it will be clear that the members of this Assembly could have done little more than turn over its pages. As has been said, "The Assembly

¹ Winzet, *Certain Tractates*, vol. i, p. 99.

² Knox, *History*, vol. i, pp. 82-3. This is probably what Winzet was referring to when he mentioned Knox's seeking "ane vther ordination of secularis" (Winzet, *Certain Tractates*, vol. i, p. 21, and cf. p. 42). The account of this matter given by Ainslie is unsatisfactory (J. L. Ainslie, *The Doctrines of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the 16th and 17th Centuries*, Edinburgh, 1940, pp. 160-3).

³ Sprott, *Ordination*, p. 194.

⁴ *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirchen* (ed. W. Niesel), second edition, Zurich, n.d. (later referred to as *Bekenntnisschriften*), p. 219. The text of the Confession is given on pp. 219-75. For further information regarding the Confession cf. W. Hildebrandt and R. Zimmermann, *Bedeutung und Geschichte des Zweiten Helvetischen Bekenntnisses*, Zurich, 1938, and *Glauben und Bekenntnis, 400 Jahre Confessio Helvetica Posterior, Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und Theologie* (ed. J. Staedtke), Zurich, 1966.

⁵ This is only recorded by Petrie (A. Petrie, *A Compendious History of the Catholic Church, From the Year 600 untill the Year 1600*, Hague, 1662, p. 374).

⁶ It seems likely that the Confession was brought to Scotland by a special emissary as it normally took a very long time for a book to reach Scotland from Zurich. For example, it took "many months" for two copies of Rodolph Gualter's *In D. Pauli apostoli epistolam ad Galatas homiliac, lxi*, Zurich, 1576, which were sent from Zurich, to reach Buchanan in 1577-78 and, a little later, Buchanan received a letter from Gualter twenty months after its despatch from Zurich (*The Zurich Letters, Second Series* (ed. H. Robinson), Parker Society, Cambridge, 1845, p. 294, p. 310 and cf. p. 312).

... , like most large gatherings, is given to commending documents which it has not read".¹ The objection to "festival days" was probably a point raised in the discussion and then incorporated into the remit to the committee.

The committee met and "considered each chapter by itself, and left nothing unexplored, and diligently examined every thing respecting God, the sacred laws and rites of the church".² A letter was dispatched as instructed by the Assembly, signed by forty-one persons.³

The account given by Calderwood of the next General Assembly⁴ and included in *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland from the Year MDLX*⁵ is not very reliable as subscriptions to the Confession made on the continent after the date of the Assembly⁶ are mentioned. This Assembly "ordained the same to be printed",⁷ but, like many other instructions given by General Assemblies to publish books and documents,⁸ the Confession was never published in Scotland⁹ nor did any section of it appear in an Act of Assembly. The Church as a whole, therefore, never knew the contents of the Confession, though it is just possible that one or two copies of the editions printed in London about 1568¹⁰ and in 1571¹¹ or *An Harmony of Confessions*, Cambridge, 1586, which contained "The latter Confession of Helvetia",¹² circulated in Scotland.

The fundamental contention of many has been that the approval of this Confession meant that in the Church in Scotland at this date, at the very latest, the inauguration of ministers was always accompanied by the laying on of hands.¹³ History proves otherwise. It should, however, be noted that it is not certain what this document meant by the laying on

¹ J. Bulloch, *The Kirk in Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1960, p. 101, and cf. J. Campbell, "John Anderson, minister of Dumbarton, and of the Ramshorn Kirk, Glasgow, 1698-1721" in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, Glasgow, 1947, vol. ix, pp. 161-3.

² *The Zurich Letters*, Second Series, p. 363.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 362-5. The letter is also printed in Knox, *Works*, vol. vi, pp. 544-50.

⁴ Calderwood, *History*, vol. ii, pp. 331-2.

⁵ p. 90.

⁶ *Bekennntnisschriften*, p. 219.

⁷ *B. U. K.*, p. 90.

⁸ Shaw, *General Assemblies*, pp. 222-4.

⁹ H. G. Aldis, *A List of Books printed in Scotland before 1700*, Edinburgh, 1904, *passim*.

¹⁰ *S.T.C.*, No. 23554.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, No. 23555.

¹² *Ibid.*, No. 5155.

¹³ Sprott, *Ordination*, p. 197; McMillan, *Worship*, pp. 343-4.

of hands.¹ Yet this is not the main point. At this time, the Church in Scotland never criticised another church's order or method of appointment to the ministry and it was probably for that reason that no comment was made.

It is very significant that this Assembly prevented the printing of William Ramsay's criticism of Bullinger's attitude to the vestarian controversy in England by having the manuscript referred to a committee for consideration and report:² nothing more was heard of it. In spite of strongly held views against the position Bullinger supported, this Assembly stated that they "intend not at this present to enter into the question",³ and at the same time sent a letter interceding for those deprived from benefices in England for refusing to wear vestments.⁴

The Church was guided by the same spirit that continued throughout the reformed churches until after the Synod of Dort. As was said in 1639, the Church's aim was to reflect "as little as might be upon the reformation of other Kirks, and choosing to receive our direction from our own reformation approved by ample testimonie of so manie forein Divines: according to the example of the venerable Assemblie at Dort, where speciall caution was, that the 30. and 31. article of the Confession of the Belgick Kirks touching Ecclesiastick order should not be examined by strangers, ther being a difference touching that point amongst reformed Kirks".⁵

In 1569, *The Form and Order of the Election of the Superintendent which may serve in election of all other ministers* appeared in print for the first time,⁶ although it is just possible that one or two copies circulated in manuscript before this date. It is, therefore, only from 1569 on that there were in effect two different orders for the same service in print (if *The Form and Order* was indeed ever used for the election of ministers other than superintendents). The possibility of using *The Form and Order* at

¹ It is worth noting that in the reformed Church in Switzerland today "exception is taken even to the ordination of ministers, on the ground that a Reformed Church only knows an induction by the Church to a particular office, but not an ordination *per se*" (J. Schweizer, "The Elements of Liturgy, Reformed" in *Ways of Worship* (ed. P. Edwall and others), London, 1951, p. 134).

² *B. U. K.*, p. 90.

³ Knox, *Works*, vol. ii, p. 545: *B. U. K.*, p. 86.

⁴ Cf. the letter sent to the "Bishops and Pastours of God's Church in England" (Knox, *Works*, vol. ii, pp. 545-7: *B. U. K.*, pp. 85-88).

⁵ "To the Reader" prefaced to *The Principall Acts of the solemn Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland: indicted by the Kings Majestic, and convened At Glasgow the xii of November, 1638*, Edinburgh, 1639.

⁶ Cowan, *Bibliography*, p. 14, No. 24, and cf. the note under No. 23. Calderwood records that this was ordered to be printed by the General Assembly of July, 1569 (*B. U. K.*, p. 155).

the inauguration of ministers was soon precluded by an Act of General Assembly of the following year,¹ although it continued to appear in subsequent editions of the Book of Common Order.

This Act, passed by the General Assembly of July, 1570, was the first injunction made by an Assembly regarding the actual service of inauguration of ministers to parishes. It was enacted, not because of any concern about the theory or practice of the admission of ministers to parishes, but because some ministers "who had once accepted the office and charge of preaching the word, had deserted their calling".² The Act was quite explicit: "all and sundry Ministers, who hereafter shall accept the said office, shall be inaugurate publickly, conforme to the order appointed in the end of the Booke of Excommunicatione:³ And Ministers at their publick inauguration sall protest solemnlie, that they sall never leave their vocation any tyme thereafter, under the paine of infamie and perjurie; and that this be done and execute be Superintendents, and Commissioners appointed for planting of kirkes".⁴ Thus, from 1570 *The Form and Order* was not officially permitted to be used except for its original purpose, and so, only one year after its appearance in print, and a year before it was included in the Book of Common Order,⁵ *The Form and Order* could not be used for the admission of ministers other than superintendents. It should further be noted that as no superintendents were appointed after 1561,⁶ it is extremely doubtful whether this order of service was used

¹ This has been completely overlooked by most of those who have written about liturgical matters concerning the Church in Scotland. In 1965, this was still the position when *The Form and Order* was merely accepted as the usual order employed at the inauguration of ministers (*Reports to the General Assembly*, 1965, p. 691).

² *B. U. K.*, p. 175, cf. p. 173.

³ This is a reference to the excommunication referred to in the section "Of their Office and Devtie" in the Book of Common Order (Maxwell, *Genevan Service Book*, p. 166, cf. pp. 38-9 *supra*).

⁴ *B. U. K.*, p. 175. This is the action of the General Assembly mentioned in the Preface to *The Forme and Maner of Ordinaing Ministers: and Consecrating of Arch-bishops and Bishops used in the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1620. The reference in the Preface that "admittance is be a publick and solemne forme of ordination", is an inaccurate description of the action of this Assembly. The Preface also incorrectly dates the Assembly as March instead of July. At the Assembly of March, 1569-70, on 5th, the matters before them were all concerned with the collection of the thirds of benefices (*B. U. K.*, pp. 161-3) and the Assembly of March, 1570-71, on 5th, considered moral offenders (*Ibid.*, pp. 189-92), so the date is undoubtedly July, 1570. McMillan allowed himself to be misled by taking the words of this Preface at their face value (McMillan, *Worship*, p. 344). The originator of the misinterpretation of McMillan was probably Sprott (Sprott, *Sermon*, p. 20).

⁵ Cowan, *Bibliography*, No. 11.

⁶ G. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, Cambridge, 1960, pp. 65 *et seq.*

again during the remainder of the sixteenth century,¹ although it may have influenced the orders of service used at the inauguration of bishops after 1572. It is, however, possible that it may have come into use later, in the seventeenth century, in place of the correct order in the Psalm Book.²

The first reference in Scotland to the laying on of hands in inauguration was by John Erskine of Dun, superintendent of Angus and Mearns, in "Ane Epistill wrettin to ane Fâythful Brother" of 13th December, 1571.³ The detailed procedure there is interesting and the practice of laying on of hands must have come into use in this synod shortly before, but it would be wrong to conclude that it was the general or accepted practice within the Church as a whole. This is shown in the "Epistill" when he states, "This godlie ordour for preservatioun of the Kirk in purity, we wis of God that the prince, the maiestrat, and all people wald admit and authorise, and nocht repyne aganis the samin".⁴ It is certain that the contents of this letter illustrate the attitude towards the admission of ministers that he had been obliged to assume in reaction to his extremely lax method of choosing readers, exhorters and ministers which had led the General Assembly of December, 1562, to ensure that he should give up the commission he had received earlier "for visiting the North, and establishing ministers, elders and deacons in the kirk".⁵ It should also be noted that for some years after the reformation he did not inaugurate men to parishes with the imposition of hands.⁶ His later views may reflect a return to Lutheran influences that in all probability played a major part in his religious development in his earlier years.⁷ Lutherans were more conservative in the form of inauguration although more radical in

¹ The view of McMillan (*Worship*, pp. 342-3) about the use and intention of this service, reveals an ingenious attempt to reconcile the facts with preconceived notions rather than a scholarly interpretation of the evidence.

² Row, *History*, pp. 326-7: *The Presbyterie Book of Kirkcaldy* (ed. W. Stevenson), Kirkcaldy, 1900, pp. 127, 130, 189-9.

³ *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club* (ed. J. Stuart), Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1849, vol. iv, p. 100.

⁴ *Ibid.* This certainly proves that the General Assembly of July, 1570, was the only Assembly to make any mention of inauguration and that there was no instruction of the necessity of the imposition of hands prior to this letter. McMillan ignores the implications of this sentence (*op. cit.*, p. 345), if he did in fact read the document. This also applies to those who produced "I. The Ministry of Word and Sacraments", para. 3 of "Report of the Panel on Doctrine" in *Reports to the General Assembly*, 1965, p. 691.

⁵ *B. U. K.*, p. 25-6.

⁶ Cf., p. 55 *infra*.

⁷ Melville, *Diary*, p. 14.

its theological interpretation¹ than were Calvin and the reformed churches.²

The procedure for the inauguration of bishops from 1572 is outwith the scope of this paper but it should be noted that inauguration in these cases involved changes from *The Form and Order of Electing Superintendents*.³ Although no Order was printed,⁴ there is a slight possibility that these services had some influence in certain quarters upon the inauguration of ministers. Notwithstanding that the bishop had no greater power than the superintendent,⁵ the imposition of hands was introduced. This may have been done to ensure the legality of the bishop's jurisdiction or his title to the temporalities of the see, but it is much more likely that it was done in obedience to what was felt to be required in complying with the mandate to consecrate issued under the Privy Seal.⁶

As the form in the second Book of Discipline was probably in some use within the Church from the late 1570's onwards the actual method of ordination prescribed there should be noted. It stated, "The ceremonies of ordination ar fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of handis of the elderschip".⁷ "Eldarschippis or Assembleis ar constitute commounlie of Pastours, Doctouris, and sic as commounlie we call Eldaris, that labour not in the Woorde and Doctrene, of quhom, and of quhais seuerall power, hes bene spoken".⁸ "Be Elderschip is menit sic as ar contitute of Pastouris, Doctouris, and sic as now are callit Eldaris".⁹ Therefore, if,

¹ H. Lieberg, *Amt und Ordination bei Luther und Melanchthon*, Göttingen, 1962, pp. 213-23, 354-7.

² The new ecclesiastical constitution in Geneva, 1541-2, i, *Les Pasteurs*, (3). (*Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (ed. B. J. Kidd), Oxford, 1911, p. 592): *Codex Liturgicus* (ed. H. A. Daniel) Leipzig, 1847-53, vol. iii, p. 234.

³ For an account of the inauguration of John Douglas, archbishop of St. Andrews, cf. Calderwood, *History*, vol. iii, pp. 206-7, and for that of David Cunningham, bishop of Aberdeen, cf. *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club*, Aberdeen, 1842, vol. ii, pp. 46-7.

⁴ Scot, *Narration*, p. 25 refers to Douglas reading answers "out of write". If this was not a manuscript order of service drawn up for the occasion, it may well have been the answers in *The Form and Order* that a superintendent was required to give.

⁵ *B. U. K.*, p. 209.

⁶ *R.S.S.*, vol. vi, Nos. 1473, 1474, 1672, 1825, 2175, 2309: vii, Nos. 101, 186, 789, 1646.

⁷ Cap. III, 12 (*B. U. K.*, p. 493). It should be noted that *all* fasted and prayed as set down in the Book of Common Order. This was continued in the Westminster Assembly's "The Directory for the Ordination of Ministers", para. 5.

⁸ Cap. VII, 1 (*Ibid.*, p. 497). To equate "elderschip" with "ordained ministers only" as Maxwell does (*Genevan Service Book*, p. 171), is not in accord with the evidence of the second Book of Discipline itself.

⁹ Cap. VII, 23 (*Ibid.*, p. 499).

under the influence of this Book, inauguration by the laying on of hands ever took place in certain areas during the period under review (though this does not seem to have happened in Fife despite the presence of the Melvilles there),¹ ministers, with doctors and elders, who had not the remotest chance of ever having received the laying on of hands, laid hands on the new minister after his election. This, however, can never be described, as McMillan has done, as simply confirming existing usage.²

The practice was almost identical with that advocated by the English Puritans in *A Second Admonition to the Parliament* in 1572.³ Moreover, the similarity between the order given there and "the manner of electing the Pastors or Ministers" in the Book of Common Order should not be overlooked. Cartwright's influence here is not to be underestimated: he had been with Andrew Melville in Geneva during 1571-2.⁴

The second Book of Discipline was of importance for the conception of the ministry of word and sacrament: it brought certain new ideas into circulation in Scotland. It grew out of discussions which began in 1576⁵ and took definite form by 1578.⁶ An attempt was made in July of that year to have it "confermit be act of parliament and have the strength of ane law" but this failed.⁷ It was, in the end, engrossed into the proceedings of the General Assembly of April, 1581 "*ad perpetuam rei memoriam*".⁸ This was done because of the failure of the King and the Three Estates to pass the Book into law. Coming, as it did, so soon after the Concordat of Leith, and being followed so quickly by the Black Acts, and obtaining no ratification by parliament, it did not find a place in the constitutional life of the church until the General Assembly of 1590 passed an Act⁹ (that was re-enforced by the Assembly of July, 1591)¹⁰, that all ministers had to accept the second Book of Discipline, though the main provisions of the Book did not receive parliamentary approval until 1592.¹¹ Within a few

¹ Cf. p. 55 *infra*.

² McMillan, *Worship*, p. 345.

³ *Puritan Manifestoes. A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt* (ed. W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas), London, 1954, pp. 96-7. Cp. *The Seconde Parte of a Register . . . 1593*, vol. i, p. 308.

⁴ C. Borgeaud, *Histoire de l'Université de Genève. L'academie de Calvin, 1559-1798*, Geneva, 1900, vol. i, pp. 107-10, 113, 119, 316; C. Borgeaud, "Cartwright and Melville at the University of Geneva, 1569-74" in *American Historical Review*, New York, 1900, vol. v, pp. 248-90; Melville, *Diary*, p. 41; A. F. Scott Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism*, Cambridge, 1925, pp. 47-8, 93.

⁵ Melville, *Diary*, p. 52.

⁶ *B. U. K.*, p. 409.

⁷ *A.P.S.*, vol. iii, p. 105.

⁸ *B. U. K.*, p. 488.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 773.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 780.

¹¹ *A.P.S.*, vol. iii, p. 541.

years, when the first episcopate was coming to power, the Book fell into disuse.

It should be noted that the second Book of Discipline was not printed until 1621 in Holland,¹ though manuscript copies were in circulation² as a result of the enactment of the General Assembly of April, 1581, that copies were to be taken to every presbytery.³

Thus, the authority of this Book as evidence for ordinations, or anything else, from 1578 onwards is not as great as is often insinuated:⁴ its real influence in the Church began in 1638.

John Morison, minister of Bathans, Garvald, Barra and Moreham,⁵ was licensed in 1582 "in any convenient places in and throughtout the whole province of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, minister the sacraments, and sincerely and purely to preach the Word of God". This case has given rise to considerable comment and speculation, which started after the publication of the licence in an appendix to John Strype's *Edmund Grindal* published in 1710. The discussion centred on the narrative at the beginning that stated that Morison "about five years past in the town of Garvet in the county of Lothian of the kingdom of Scotland, [had been] admitted and ordained to Holy Orders and the sacred Ministry by the General Synod or Congregation of the said county, assembled in the said town of Garvet, by imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the reformed Church of Scotland".⁶

The licence was issued by Dr. William Aubrey, who had been appointed by Queen Elizabeth to act along with Dr. William Clark as vicars general during the latter part of the suspension of Edmund Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury.⁷

This document reveals that shortly after Morison was deprived of his

¹ S.T.C., 22015, cf. p. 4 *supra*, regarding the Book of Discipline.

² Two copies endorsed "Mr. James Carmichael's book" are in S. P. Scot, Eliz., vol. xxix (G. Donaldson, "Scottish Presbyterian Exiles in England" in *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, Glasgow, 1963, vol. xiv, p. 77n, 3).

³ B. U. K., p. 488.

⁴ E.g. *Reports to the General Assembly*, 1963, p. 754.

⁵ H. Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ*, New and revised edition, Edinburgh (later referred to as Scott, *Fasti*), 1915, vol. i, p. 398.

⁶ J. Strype, *The History of . . . Edmund Grindal*, London, 1710, Book II, Appendix No. XVII, gives the latin text.

⁷ I. J. Churchill, *Canterbury Administration*, London, 1933 (later referred to as Churchill, *Canterbury Admin.*), vol. i, pp. 25-35.

Scottish benefice in 1580 "for certain offences",¹ he sought a licence from Grindal to preach in the province of Canterbury.² It is significant that he applied to Grindal and not merely to the bishop in whose diocese he proposed to preach. This shows that Morrison was one of those who would be considered "a Godly Preacher". Grindal was greatly concerned to ensure that there were enough preachers. His influence is apparent in the number of Puritans who were preachers in the diocese of London when he was bishop there.³ He appointed more than forty new preachers in the diocese of York during his six years as archbishop of York.⁴ It should be remembered that Queen Elizabeth thought that it was good for the Church of England to have few preachers⁵ and "of the four Elizabethan Archbishops [of Canterbury], Matthew Parker, Edmund Grindal, John Whitgift, and Richard Bancroft, only Grindal had any real insight into the dynamic which lay behind the persistence of the Godly Preachers and the need for evangelical preaching in the Church".⁶ Morrison was therefore licenced solely to preach. He would not have required such a licence had he been merely concerned to obtain a benefice in the Church of England. Most of the beneficed clergy in the Church of England at that time were not authorised to preach.⁷ "Homilies were far safer utterances than sermons".⁸ This, as has been said, was the view emanating from the Queen. However, the same year in which he received the licence, he became perpetual curate of St. Botolph Aldersgate.⁹

¹ Register of presentations (H.M. General Register House), vol. ii, f. 46, quoted by G. Donaldson, "Foundation of Anglo-Scottish Union" in *Elizabethan Government and Society, Essays presented to Sir John Neale* (ed. S. T. Bindoff and others), London, 1961, p. 306.

² In the licence it is stated that he had been "ordained" for five years, whereas, in 1582, he had been about seven years in the ministry (Scott, *op. cit.*).

³ Cf. H. G. Owen, *London Parish Clergy in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, London, University Ph.D. Thesis, 1957.

⁴ *Remains of Edmund Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury* (ed. W. Nicholson), Parker Society, London, 1843, p. 380

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

⁶ I. Morgan, *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*, London, 1965, p. 92.

⁷ E.g., in 1562, only eighteen had licences to preach in the cathedral church and archdeaconry of Winchester (A. W. Goodman, "The Cathedral Church and the Archdeaconry of Winchester in 1562" in *Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society, Papers and Proceedings*, Southampton, 1938, vol. xiv, p. 2) and in the archdeaconry of Surrey there were "only a dozen general licences to preach (G. Baskerville and A. W. Goodman, "Surrey Incumbents in 1562" in *Surrey Archaeological Society. Collections*, London, 1937, vol. xlv, p. 98).

⁸ Baskerville and Goodman, *op. cit.*

⁹ R. Newcourt, *Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense*, London, 1708-10, vol. i, p. 916.

Furthermore, Grindal's outlook would almost certainly be governed by the thirty-fourth Article of the Thirty-nine Articles of 1562. "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying". Grindal would never have thought of criticising the method of inaugurating ministers in Scotland, let alone urging some form of "re-ordination".¹ These problems were to be raised later, and in England.

Morison was undoubtedly one of the Puritan group in the Church of England and he was associated with the Scottish presbyterians who went to England after the passing of the Black Acts of 1584.²

The legality of the licence was raised long ago but since the vicar general was competent to act in any capacity during the vacancy in a see,³ this matter can be considered closed.

The wording of the licence itself is the important matter. In it there are expressions then alien to Scotland: e.g., "holy orders" and "divine offices". A reference is made to "the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland"—the only "rite" was the order in the Book of Common Order which made no reference to "holy orders", "ordination", or to the laying on of hands. While the statement that Morison had been "ordained . . . by the General Synod or Congregation of the said county" cannot be an accurate account of what took place as this was the function of the superintendent with the advice of "the best learned being present".⁴

The whole question has been further complicated by the comments made by many who were ignorant of sixteenth century Scottish history, ecclesiastical practice, and doctrine. As early as the beginning of the eighteenth century, shortly after the publication of the licence by Strype, William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, wrote about a "Scot-Presbyterian"⁵ when referring to Morison in his reply to Père Le Courayer

¹ E.g., in 1570, John Willock, who had been one of those responsible for the first Book of Discipline and the Scots Confession, where certain views regarding inauguration were propounded (cf. pp. 39, 42 *supra*), was appointed by Grindal to the prebend of Ealdland in St. Paul's without any concern about matters of order (G. Hennessy, *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense*, London, 1898, p. 25). Willock's Roman ordination was undoubtedly invalidated on grounds similar to those of Knox and others (cf. pp. 43-4 *supra*).

² This is shown by his presence at the funeral of James Lawson in October, 1584. Cf. Donaldson, "Scottish Presbyterian Exiles in England", p. 74, and the references given there.

³ Churchill, *Canterbury Admin.*, vol. i, pp. 25-35.

⁴ *B. U. K.*, pp. 15-16, 27, 34.

⁵ *Biographia Britannica*, London, 1766, vol. vi, pt. ii, p. 4094.

who had raised the question "de la validité de l'ordination d'un ministre écossais ordonné selon le rit presbytérien d'Ecosse".¹ There were no Scottish presbyterians in 1575 nor was there any "ordination". From this time, all sorts of misunderstandings arose and all kinds of scholars have, thereafter, been interested in this relatively unimportant case. They have usually been content to repeat and follow one another.² Much has been read into the document but no one has ever considered the document itself.

The most important point is that the issuing of such a licence was a continuation of medieval procedure,³ but not a post-reformation sixteenth century Scottish practice. Consequently, no Scottish document would have been produced by Morison when he applied for his English licence. He may not have stated more than that he had been admitted to his Scottish parish as a minister of word and sacraments as distinct from a reader or an exhorter. It must also not be overlooked that this licence was issued by a civilist, Dr. William Aubrey,⁴ and it would certainly be drawn up according to a style that was used in the drafting of many other licences. Sixteenth century formularies of this sort for a number of English dioceses are still extant, e.g., Chichister,⁵ Exeter,⁶ and York.⁷

It must also be remembered that Spottiswood, superintendent of Lothian, was one of the committee of six that drew up the Book of Discipline⁸ and he did not have the laying on of hands at his own inauguration as superintendent of Lothian.⁹ Even if, for some exceptional personal reason, Spottiswood did inaugurate Morison to the parish of Bathans,

¹ Arch W. Epist., vol. ii, f. 30, quoted by N. Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, Cambridge, 1956, p. 97.

² E.g., T. McCrie, *Life of Knox*, Edinburgh, Second edition, 1813, vol. i, p. 56n.: Sprott, *Ordination*, p. 203; Sprott, *Offices*, pp. 190, 196; McMillan, *Worship*, p. 345; Sykes, *op. cit.*, p. 96 *et seq.*

³ G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1926, pp. 142-3: cf. *St. Andrews Formulare, 1514-1546* (ed. G. Donaldson and C. Macrae), Stair Society, Edinburgh, 1942, vol. i, pp. 327-8, for a licence to a friar issued by Andrew Forman, archbishop of St. Andrews, to preach and hear confessions throughout his diocese, and Churchill, *Canterbury Admin.*, vol. i, p. 505, n. 5, for examples of licences to preach throughout the diocese and province of Canterbury.

⁴ *Dictionary of National Biography* (ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee), London, 1908, vol. i, pp. 717-8.

⁵ *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections*, Historical Manuscripts Commission, London, 1901, vol. i, p. 199.

⁶ Bodleian Library, MS. Arch. Seld, sup. 42.

⁷ Cambridge University Library, Add. MS., 3115.

⁸ Knox, *History*, vol. i, p. 343.

⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 273-7.

Garvald, Barra and Moreham on 1st May, 1575, with the imposition of hands, this was in no sense the practice in the Church and cannot be regarded as indicative of the general practice of Spottiswood. Spottiswood may have had different views in 1575 from those to which he subscribed in 1560, but, in that case, it is surprising that he does not appear to have sought to have the inauguration of ministers with the laying on of hands introduced into the Church, not even when, in 1571, he might have done so in support of his fellow superintendent, John Erskine of Dun, who had been unable to obtain the approval of "the prince, the maiestratis, and all people".¹

The case of Morison, the Godly Preacher or Puritan, is therefore too vague for a general principle to be founded upon it. Nor is it to the point: plenty of reliable material is available elsewhere upon which to base an account of the practice of inauguration.

Much has been said about the admission of Robert Bruce as one of the ministers of Edinburgh in 1587. Before we consider the matter, however, we should note that the case of Bruce was not, as has so often been blandly claimed,² an isolated instance of someone who then undertook all the functions of a minister without the laying on of hands. Bruce had colleagues at Edinburgh. James Balfour had been admitted about 1563 as minister of Guthrie and Idvie³ without the laying on of hands,⁴ almost certainly by John Erskine of Dun, superintendent of Angus and Mearns. Robert Rollock, William Watson, John Hall, Walter Balcanqual, George Robertson and Peter Hewat were all re-admitted to the ministry by the laying on of hands on 18th April, 1598.⁵ Robert Wilkie, minister of St. Andrews, who had previously been a regent in the University of St. Andrews, is another example. The statement made by Patrick Adamson, archbishop of St. Andrews, that Wilkie had "no imposition of hands" while acting as moderator of the Synod of Fife in April, 1586, was never repudiated by Wilkie himself nor by any other member of the synod.⁶ While other examples might be cited the cases mentioned are significant as these

¹ Cf. p. 48, *supra*.

² This was probably originated by Robert Wodrow (*Sermons by the Rev. Robert Bruce . . . With collections for his life, by the Rev. Robert Wodrow* (ed. W. Cunningham), Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1843 (later referred to as *Bruce, Sermons*), p. 14), and still accepted uncritically in 1965 when it is asserted that "no clear case [of the laying on of hands being omitted] has so far been proved" (*Reports to the General Assembly*, 1965, p. 691).

³ Scott, *Fasti*, vol. viii, p. 511.

⁴ Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, pp. 722-3.

⁵ Cf. p. 58 *infra*.

⁶ Calderwood, *History*, vol. iv, pp. 513, 517.

admissions to parishes occurred in three different synods and may be taken as typical of the prevailing practice and opinion. It is just possible that in some synods there was some variation in practice but there is no evidence now extant to support this. The pre-reformation bishops who conformed may have continued some medieval ceremonial but it is also possible that they were stricter in such matters than the more vocal reformers so as to avoid charges of being papistical.

The case of Robert Bruce's inauguration has been interpreted in many ways since at least the time of William Scot, minister of Cupar.¹ The earliest sources are the *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies* 1560-1600, and Calderwood's *History*. The latter is coloured by seventeenth century conceptions. The following facts emerge.

The actual date on which Bruce became minister of Edinburgh is uncertain because of his hesitation about accepting the charge. It would appear, however, to have fallen sometime between the General Assembly of August, 1588, and August, 1589, for his stipend was fixed by the town council of Edinburgh on 15th August, 1589,² yet it should be noted that he was considered to be a minister by the General Assembly of June, 1587, which was prior to his admission to Edinburgh.³

Whatever happened to make Bruce decide to accept the charge of Edinburgh, the story given by Henry Livingstone, minister of St. Ninian's, Stirling, which was written some decades after the event, is somewhat confused and rather unsatisfactory.⁴ Nevertheless, the main point is made crystal clear. This is that the people pressed Bruce to undertake a full and permanent ministry in their midst and that he regarded this as a lawful call to the ministry there nothing further being essential.⁵

On 15th October, 1589, he was appointed by the King to a commission to try beneficed persons. On this occasion he was referred to as a minister and preacher of God's Word.⁶ He was also granted under the Privy Seal

¹ Scot, *Narration*, p. 106.

² H. Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae*, Edinburgh, 1866, part i, p. 4.

³ *B. U. K.*, p. 700.

⁴ Bruce, *Sermons*, pp. 15-16. None of the ministers, who might have "entrapped him" into the position of having to dispense the sacrament, had any reason to "entrap" him. Of the four ministers then in Edinburgh, Walter Balcanqual, Robert Rollock, and William Watson had certainly not received the imposition of hands themselves (cf. p. 58 *infra*) and it is improbably that John Cairns, if he ever was more than a reader, had been admitted with the laying on of hands as he had been in Edinburgh since 1555 (Scott, *Fasti*, vol. i, p. 53).

⁵ Cf. p. 58 *infra*.

⁶ Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, pp. 64-7.

from that date on a life stipend of £170 out of the thirds of the Abbey of Arbroath.¹

James VI asked for Bruce's daily prayers for himself and his "new rib" shortly after his marriage² and addressed him as "Minister of the Evangell at Edinburgh".³ At the coronation of the Queen, Bruce took the foremost part⁴ and preached two days later before her.⁵

In face of this evidence, it is sheer nonsense to speak of Bruce's acting during this time as a licenciate as Wotherspoon does.⁶ From at least the middle of 1587 Bruce undoubtedly had the status of a minister equal to that of any other.

It was the King who pressed for the ceremony of the imposition of hands. This may have been connected with his antipathy towards Bruce as well as his concern for uniformity with the Church of England. James propounded in *The Questions to be resolvit at the Convention of Estaits and General Assemblie . . .*, Edinburgh, 1597,⁷ as question six, "Is he a lauffull Pastor, who wants *impositionem manuum*."

Answers were forthcoming within a short time from the Synod of Fife: "Imposition or laying on of hands, is not essentiall and necessar, but ceremoniall and indifferent, in admission of a pastor".⁸ Some, including Patrick Galloway, also said that "The ceremonie is indifferent, if the apostolick dueteis of ordination be weill observed and followed".⁹ Another observed, "The Admission of the kirk serves for imposition of hands".¹⁰ These attitudes may be taken as typical.

Under pressure from James VI, the General Assembly of May, 1597,

¹ The interlocutor in *Bruce v. Hamilton* (or, as the case would now be designated, *M.P. Auchterlonie and Others v. Bruce and Hamilton*) quoted by T. M., Cooper, "The King versus the Court of Session" in *The Juridical Review*, Edinburgh, 1946, vol. lviii, p. 89.

² Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, p. 82.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. v, pp. 83, 91.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. v, pp. 95-6: Spottiswood, *History*, vol. ii, p. 408.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. v, p. 97.

⁶ Wotherspoon, *Adequate Security*, p. 24n. He claims that Spottiswood explained that Bruce had at that time the status of a licenciate but the reference he quotes does not support such a claim and, further, it should be noted that the term "licence" did not appear in any document of the Church until it was used in the Act of General Assembly, 1694, 10. To refer to Bruce at that time as "an expectant or probationer" (McMillan, *Worship*, p. 346) is equally unscholarly.

⁷ Aldis, *List*, No. 30.

⁸ Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, p. 587, and Melville, *Diary*, p. 392.

⁹ Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, p. 597.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. v, p. 600.

ordained "that there be an vnformitie in the ordination of the Ministrie throughout the haill contrey, imposition of hands: and that they be admittit to certaine flocks, vpon the quhilk they salbe astricted to attend, according to the Acts of the Assemblies made of befor".¹

At the General Assembly of April, 1598, Robert Rollock, the moderator, informed Robert Bruce, when he had agreed to accept a parish within Edinburgh, that he would only be permitted to do so on condition of his accepting the imposition of hands along with the other ministers who were to be admitted or readmitted to various parishes in the city.² Rollock was included in this group of ministers as he had not received the ceremony of laying on of hands though he had been a minister in Edinburgh since 1596.³ The King was present at this Assembly and it is obvious that he was behind the introduction of the practice. Bruce refused to comply with the condition.⁴

The debates between Bruce and James VI at Holyrood reveal the pressure that the King was exerting to have the laying on of hands used within the Church in Scotland.⁵ While the record is confused,⁶ and no doubt influenced by the seventeenth century views of Calderwood, it is certain that, for Bruce, lawful calling was the fundamental and sole essential for exercising a ministry in the Church of God.⁷ This is quite clear from his statement when the first attempt was made to inaugurate him with the laying on of hands. His views on the ceremony were manifest; he took it to be a matter of indifference. He was quite prepared to submit on condition that his ministry was not called into question and that it was a confirmation of and not an ordination to his ministry. He demanded a written statement from the ministers present that the ceremony was merely "confirmatioun" of his ministry. They refused. Bruce was asked to come to them and "he sould find contentment" but they would not agree to sign a statement.⁸

Then Calderwood records, most significantly, that the elders who were

¹ *B. U. K.*, p. 925.

² Melville, *Diary*, p. 419.

³ Spottiswoode, *History*, vol. iii, p. 58, and cf. Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, p. 710; Scott, *Fasts*, vol. i, p. 54.

⁴ Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, p. 711.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. v, pp. 711-717, 720 *et seq.*

⁶ It speaks of Bruce being asked to "accept a particular floeke" (*Ibid.*, vol. v, p. 711) and before any form of admission, is threatened with "the sentence of deprivation" (*Ibid.*, vol. v, pp. 717 and 721).

⁷ Bruce "proved before the people, that he laiked nothing that was essential to a lawful calling" (*Ibid.*, vol. v, p. 714).

⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. v, p. 714.

sitting on forms beside the ministers, called out, " 'We acknowledge him to be our pastor' and in token therof tooke him by the hand. They prayed Mr. Robert Pont [the presiding minister] to give his blessing and to admitt. But he refused, and went to the prayer, and so ended".¹

It is obvious that here we have an account of what the kirk session and congregation had come to understand by the service of inauguration. After the election of the minister by the congregation, the presiding minister sought God's blessing (not "ordination" or anything which was interpreted as such by those conducting the service) and declared the minister to be admitted. Then the elders, and possibly the deacons, took the minister by the hand as token of their assent. In other words, the service in the Book of Common Order was the one to which they were accustomed.

When, on 19th May, 1598, Bruce finally submitted to the laying on of hands in company with James Balfour, a month after the mass readmission to the ministry of the other Edinburgh ministers, the service again reflects the order in the Psalm Book with merely the addition of the imposition of hands. "Mr. Robert Pont made a sermoun in the Little or East Kirk of Edinburgh; and after sermoun, and the declaratioun foresaid made, came doun frome the pulpit, and layed hands upon the heads of Mr. Robert and Mr. James Balfour. The elders and deacons, sitting beside upon furmes, tooke them by the hands, and receaved them as their lawfull pastors".²

It should be noted that this service at which only one minister conducted the whole was similar to that obtaining in France.³ One minister, however, "ordaining" seems strange within the presbyterian structure which had been law since 1592. The reason may have been that Pont had

¹ Calderwood, *History*, vol. v, p. 714-5.

² *Ibid.*, vol. v, p. 723.

³ The reformed churches did not practice the laying on of hands. The only exception was the reformed Church of France where it was common, though not general practice, from 1559 (Quick, *Synodicon*, vol. i, pp. 3, 62, 93). It should be noted, however, that only one of the two ministers, deputed by the synod or colloquy to conduct the admission of the minister, actually laid hands on the newly inaugurated minister (Campbell, *Book of Order*, p. 3). This therefore in no way resembled what is now understood to be presbyterial "ordination". Many Scots were ordained in France in the way described. Robert Boyd, principal of the University of Glasgow, for example, was ordained with the imposition of hands by Pastor Pacard in 1604 when he was admitted pastor of Verteuil (*Collections upon the lives of the Reformers and most eminent Ministers of the Church of Scotland. By the Rev. Robert Wodrow* (ed. W. J. Duncan), Maitland Club, Glasgow, 1845, vol. ii, p. 31. Cp. English presbyterian practice of 1587 as described in *A Seconde Parte of a Register . . . 1593*, vol. ii, p. 218).

been a commissioner for the visiting of churches and was acting in a supra-ministerial or -presbyterial manner. The words of Calderwood, who was not against the imposition of hands, appear to be correct. "It is to be observed, that this imposition of hands, wherabout all this bussinesse was made, was holdin for a ceremonie unnecessarie and indifferent in our kirk, whill that now, laying the foundatioun of episcopacie, it was urged as necessar. For it being layed as a ground, that none can receave ordination to the ministrie without imposition of hands, and this ceremonie was proper to bishops, it behoved to follow that none could enter in the ministrie without imposition of hands by bishops, who were to be brought in, according to the intent of the king and the commissioners, at that same verie tyme when they were so strict with Mr. Robert".¹ This was also the view of an early seventeenth century writer who stated that "a minister wes admitted without imposition of hands till of late, and onlie receaved with reaching out of the hands of some of the elders. Imposition of hands was not urged till 1597 yere of God that episcopacie was in hatching".²

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the practice of the Church remained indeterminate. Procedure was quite varied with inaugurations in different forms even in the same presbytery. For example, on 3rd January, 1605, Andrew Hamilton was "admittit minister at Kilbarquhay [Kilbarchan] *per impositionem manuum presbyteratus*",³ while in July of the following year Alexander Hamilton was admitted minister of Houston "*dexteris societatis*".⁴ There is ample evidence that the latter was an inauguration and not merely a translation. Regular pre-ordination trials were held and all other normal procedure observed.⁵

At the General Assembly of June, 1610, it was laid down that, upon the bishop receiving a certificate from the ministers within the bounds as to the qualifications of the presentee, "the Bishop is to take farther tryall; and finding him qualified, and being assisted be such of the Ministrie of the bounds quher he is to serve, as he will assume to himselfe, he is then to perfyte the haill act of ordination".⁶ This was the first time that it was enacted by an Assembly that there must be episcopal ordination.

¹ *The History of the Church of Scotland by John Spottiswood* (ed. M. Napier). Spottiswood Society, Edinburgh, 1850, vol. iii, p. 211.

² National Library of Scotland, Wodrow MSS., fol. vol. xlix, No. 24.

³ MS. Minutes of the Presbytery of Paisley.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *B. U. K.*, p. 1096.

A high commission for the ordering of ecclesiastical causes was instituted by James VI shortly after and one of the directions given to it was "That no minister be admitted without an exact trial preceding, and imposition of hands used in their ordination by the bishop and two or three ministers whom he shall call to assist the action: and to the end an uniform order may be kept in the admission of ministers, that a form thereof may be imprinted and precisely followed of every bishop".¹ Although this direction, among others, was approved by a convention of the bishops and some of the ministry in February, 1611,² no action seems to have been taken with regard to the inauguration of ministers and no form of service was printed. There is a reference in 1615 to "Ane vniform Ordour for Electing Ministeris and their resavinge" in "Articles required for the Service of the Church in Scotland" in the handwritng of John Spottiswood but nothing further came of this.³ It should be noted that the document was more concerned with bringing the practice of the Church of Scotland into line with that of England than with the inauguration of ministers to parishes in Scotland.⁴

It would appear that in spite of this movement within the Church and the Act of Assembly of 1610, inauguration was still not invariably accompanied by the laying on of hands; the General Assembly of August, 1616, had to re-enact "That none teach in pulpit publictly before the people, but these that have received imposition of hands; and whosoever does other ways be incapable of the Ministry".⁵ It should also be noted that the inauguration of ministers was still regulated by the Book of Common Order in 1618 which is made plain by an Act of General Assembly of that year.⁶

It was sought to make the practice of the Church uniform by the publication of *The Forme and Maner of Ordaining Ministers: and Consecrating of Arch-Bishops and Bishops used in the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1620,⁷ but this did not solve the problem. There was still considerable diversity of thought and practice. Some continued to use

¹ *The History of the Church of Scotland* by John Spottiswood, vol. iii, p. 211.

² *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 212.

³ *Original letters relating to the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland, . . . MDCXIV. MDCXXV* (ed. D. Laing), Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1851, vol. ii, pp. 445-6.

⁴ "These thingis must be advysit and agreit vpon in ane General Assembly of the Clergie (*sic*), quich must be drawn to the form of the Convocation House heir in England (*Ibid.*).

⁵ *B. U. K.*, p. 1124.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1164.

⁷ *S.T.C.*, No. 16606.

the Book of Common Order.¹ As no mention is made of *The Forme* by any seventeenth century writer,² little can therefore be said about its influence, while, on account of Laud's condemnation of the book,³ those who held similar views abandoned it and used the English Ordinal.⁴

The tensions which had developed in the Church towards the end of the sixteenth century were not resolved and both in 1638 and 1660⁵ new beginnings were made which still influence the Church in Scotland today.

¹ Row, *History*, pp. 326-7.

² McMillan, *Worship*, p. 348.

³ W. Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkness brought to publicke Life, or a necessary Introduction to the History of the Archbishop of Canterburies Traill*, London, 1645, pp. 152-3.

⁴ *A Large Declaration concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland, from their first originals*, London, 1639, p. 20.

⁵ G. Donaldson, "Scottish Ordinations in the Restoration Period" in *S.H.R.* Edinburgh, 1954, vol. xxxiii, pp. 169-75.
